IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.S.RADHAKRISHNAN
&
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.K.MOHANAN

THURSDAY, THE 9TH AUGUST 2007 / 18TH SRAVANA 1929

WA.No. 473 of 2002(C)
---
AGAINST THE JUDGEMENT IN OP.5328/1996
.....

APPELLANT: APPELLANT/PETITIONER IN O.P:
---

BINDU C.P., PLOT NO.16,
P.T.P. NAGAR P.O., THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-38.

BY ADV. SRI.C.P.SUDHAKARA PRASAD
SRI.ELVIN PETER P.J.
SRI.S.RAMESH
SRI.P.N.SANTHOSH
SRI.S.D.ASOKAN

RESPONDENTS: RESPONDENTS/RESPONDENTS IN O.P:
---

1. KERALA AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY,
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR,
VELLANIKKARA, THRISSUR.

2. MINI. C., AWAMI, GANDHI NAGAR,
P.O. MANNUTHI, THRISSUR.

3. JYOTHI BHASKAR, LEKSHMI NIVAS,
H.NO.14/2, CHULLICKAL, KOCHI-5.

4. VEENAKUMARI D., 123, MANDAKINI HOSTEL,
I.A.R.I., NEW DELHI.

5. SREELATHA U., UNNIAMPURATH HOUSE,
PERUVANAM, CHERPU, THRISSUR-680 651.

6. PRADEEP KUMAR T., SAUPARNIKA,
P.O. PINARAYI, TELLICHERRY, KANNUR DIST.

7. ANCY JOSEPH, TRAINING ASSOCIATE,
K.V.K., C.P.C.R.I., KUDLU, KASARAGODE.

BY ADV. SRI.R. SURENDRAN
SRI.SAJAN MANNALI
SRI.LAKSHMI NARAYAN

SRI.N.N.SUGUNAPALAN
SRI.M.P.JAYAKUMAR
SMT.T.KPRASEEDA
SRI.N.D.PREMACHANDRAN, SC, AGRL.UNTY.
SRI.RENJITH THAMPAN,SC,KERALA AGRL.UTY

THIS WRIT APPEAL HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 09/08/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

**K.S.RADHAKRISHNAN & V.K.MOHANAN, JJ**

---

W.A. 473/2002

---

Dated this the 9th day of August, 2007

**JUDGMENT**

Radhakrishnan, J

Appeal arises out of the judgment in O.P.5328/1996 which was preferred seeking a writ of certiorari to call for the records leading to the selection of Assistant Professors in Horticulture pursuant to Ext.P1 notification and quash the same to the extent it is inconsistent with Ext.P7 rotation chart. Counter affidavit has been filed by the first respondent. In paragraph 4 of the counter affidavit, it has been stated that the Selection Committee, after the interview prepared the rank list of the persons in the order of merit. Petitioner was not included in the rank list, but respondents 2 to 7 were included in the rank list and according to the respondents, they possess superior qualifications compared to the petitioner. Ext.R1(b) chart showing the relative qualifications and experience of the petitioner and the respondents 2 to 7 is produced before us. Complaint of the petitioner is that the rotation chart is not properly

applied, since she was not included in the rank list. We find it difficult to accept the contentions.

In the facts and circumstances of the case, appeal is without any merit and the same is dismissed.

**K.S.RADHAKRISHNAN**
**Judge**

**V.K.MOHANAN**
**Judge**

mrcs